R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 074 CG 000 233

THE SCHOOL COUNSELLOR IN A CHANGING SOCIETY.

BY- WILLIAMSON, E. G.

PUB DATE NOV 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.88 22P.

DESCRIPTORS- COUNSELOR TRAINING, *COUNSELING EFFECTIVENESS, *COUNSELING GOALS, VOCATIONAL COUNSELING, *INNOVATION, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, SPEECHES, DON MILLS, ONTARIO

THE MAJOR CHANGES IN COUNSELING THAT HAVE TAKEN PLACE OVER THE LAST HALF-CENTURY ARE (1) THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAREER CHOICE WITH THE IDEA OF CHANGE IN MIND, (2) THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INDIVIDUALIZED VALUE HIERARCHY, (3) THE EMPHASIS ON PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT, (4) THE CONCEPT OF COUNSELING RELATIONSHIPS AS A NUMBER OF INTERRELATED RELATIONSHIPS, (5) THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PERSON AS AN INDIVIDUAL, (6) THE ABANDONMENT OF COUNSELOR NEUTRALITY, (7) THE COUNSELOR'S ABILITY TO RISE ABOVE HIS OWN PREJUDICES, (8) THE MOVE TO HELPING THE COUNSELOR LEARN TO ADAPT TO AUTOMATION, (9) THE COUNSELOR'S INVOLVEMENT WITH DISCIPLINE WHICH IS CHARACTER MOLDING, AND (10) THE NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN COUNSELOR TRAINING AND GROWTH. COUNSELORS ARE GRADUALLY GOING BEYOND TECHNIQUE, AND, IN THE FUTURE, TECHNIQUE MUST BE DEVELOPED ON A TECHNOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT. THESE BASIC CHANGES WILL ALLOW THE COUNSELOR TO AID STUDENTS TO MORE EFFECTIVELY BECOME FULLY HUMANE PERSONS. THIS PAPER WAS PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ONTARIO SCHOOL COUNSELLOR'S ASSOCIATION (2D, DON MILLS, NOVEMBER 10-12, 1966). (AF)

ED012074

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ONTARIO SCHOOL COUNSELLORS' ASSOCIATION

THE SCHOOL COUNSELLOR IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

E.G. Williamson
Dean of Students and Professor of Psychology
University of Minnesota

SELF-CONCEPT OF THE SCHOOL COUNSELLOR

Dr. L.A. Isabelle
Professor, Faculty of
Psychology and Education,
Ottawa University, Ottawa

THE CHANGING NEEDS OF THE COUNSELLEE

Dr. Wilson Head
Director,
Social Planning
Council, Toronto

Addresses given
at the

Second Annual Conference

November 10-12, 1966

Inn on the Park

Don Mills, Ontario.

CG 000 233

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THE SCHOOL COUNSELOR IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

E. G. Williamson
Dean of Students and Professor of Psychology
University of Minnesota

Thank you very much, Father Pare, for your very kind words. I am very happy to be here and next week, when I meet with the Executive Council of the APGA in Washington, I will secure permission for extending to you our hope for a good year. You know, as I took a drink of water, which I asked for, I recalled that during the last year my wife and I had a dry throat. I thought at first that I picked it up at Berkeley from the "bearded ones," because I was out there a year ago to talk about freedom. I think I made no converts to my concept of freedom within restraint, rather than freedom without external restraint.

Your topic is a fascinating one and I would like to address myself to it in terms of some changes in counseling, our conception and techniques of counseling over the years. I would first like to create a backdrop for my speech by naming four sources which bring about changes in our conceptions of counseling and have also brought about changes in technique and method in the last half-century, in North American culture, and will undoubtedly bring about many, many other changes in the future years. One of the fascinating problems that I will try to deal with, which I will not be able to solve "before I retire" (incidentally, I have a growing list of such problems), is the problem of how to deal with the need to keep current and relevant with the changing society and particularly with the changing clientele that we deal with in counseling. It is clear that our students are not the same today as when you and I went to school. We can argue whether they are better or worse, but I think they are much better, much smarter, much more open to compassion than when I was an undergraduate. And this is to acknowledge that there are social forces that are acting upon us in our work with our clientele.

Let me mention a few such forces. It is obvious that the world of work is not the same as when you and I prepared for work. We are now told that sometime in the future, perhaps by the year 2000, there will not be work for us. Instead we will be paid for "not working." That obiter dictum makes my Calvanistic soul writhe. I was raised to seek the middleclass virtue of industriousness. This motivation has led me to try to deal with that perplexing, gnawing problem of the high ability underachiever, who does not want to use his ability. What can we do with him? Well, we try to "beat hell out of him". But nothing I ever did succeeded and, so, I finally helped them withdraw from school. Nevertheless, obviously the rate of change of our industrial culture has accelerated in the past few decades and threatens to accelerate in the future; so perhaps I will need to return again to unsolved problems after all. Changes in the world of work are so tremendous and accelerated that we cannot keep up with them; we are constantly out of date. I do not know what to do about it, except to admit our ignorance of the motivations of our student clientele: they know of it already.

The second major force that I will not discuss, but mention, is the changing role of North America in world affairs. I come from a state where the concept of political and power isolationism was enunciated by our Senator Shipstead in the 1920s, in part in the fond hope that because we were a long way from the oceans, therefore we could forget the rest of the universe. We now see that this is silly, provincial and, therefore, inadequate for the 20th century man and certainly inadequate for the 21st century. So we have to face the implications and consequences of the changing role of our countries in world affairs. The other day at Harvard some students tries to get rid of this world role problem by booing Secretary McNamara.

But this is a silly thing to do; he did not cause the universe, he did not create America's role and responsibility for world affairs. He is trying to do the best job that he knows how, whether you agree with our Vietnam policy or not. It is a mess--maybe an insoluable mess--but we cannot turn our back upon our new world roles among the nations. And this fact has all kinds of implications for us counselors. It is not the safe and isolated world that you and I grew up in and today that fact frightens many of our student clientele and they do not know what to do about it. The third source of societal (and personal) change is one that fascinates me. Indeed, I have a hard time communicating, convincingly, to my faculty colleagues that we now know more about human development today than when you and I were children. We simply have a technical knowledge that was not then available. I was discussing this problem of counseling with a group of American administrative interns, as they were called, preparing to be administrators and one learned man said, "Well, after all, isn't counseling just common sense?" I said, "Heavens--must we repeat the last half century of research for you to become informed?" He was a learned ignorant person--outside of his specialty.

We do know more about the terribly complex problem of "growing up", hopefully to become the kind of adult that you and I want our clientele to become. And education has been assigned new roles because of this increasing knowledge, new roles to help individuals grow up in new dimensions, some not even thought of by the ancient Greeks--perhaps!--and Brother Hutchins can rave all he wants to; there is no turning back to the Middle Ages. We must deal with education in terms of new knowledge that was not available, not even to the founding fathers of our institutions of higher learning.

The fourth source of change that impinges upon counseling and is shaping it and reshaping it in many ways is the increasing sophistication of our knowledge of relevant forms of assistance, or new techniques, of helping students who want to strive to develop their full potentialities. Let me repeat--who want to strive to develop their full potentialities. These are new and more sophisticated forms of aiding youth to develop their full potentiality. The literature on this and other sources of forced change is growing exponentially. Thus, my desk is piled this high with literature that I have not yet been able to read. When I go on a trip like this I just fill my briefcase, hoping that I can read a little bit more; but it is a hopeless task--you just cannot keep up, there is so much being produced.

So much for my characterization of the backdrop of our culture and some of its effects upon education, educators, counselors and our students. These forces vary in intensity in different periods of history and are changing the nature of the counseling relationship. Indeed, one can very quickly earn a reputation, a deserved reputation, for being a fuddy-duddy, if one does not understand that one is indeed "out of date" in theory and technique, <u>even before you get your certification</u>. But I identify one more emerging dimension of modern counseling in the schools. I hold to a philosophy of counseling which assigns to each counselor the task of learning to philosophize about the human situation. This brings me into the great nexus of unsolved problems about value commitments, which we are only now beginning to face realistically in a counselor's professional preparation. Heretofore, we had been taught to be "objective"; the old German concept of objectivity was our model. We were trying to get rid of subjectivity; we seemed to assume that the meter could read itself, which is philosophic nonsense, we now see. But it has taken us a long time to see

that all education is in the value business and that every student needs assistance in arriving at some kind of sophisticated understanding of his own value commitments, what he is trying to do with his life, what he is trying to achieve. He needs also to understand that there are alternative values, other than the ones that he may have unconsciously developed or borrowed from someone else. No, every counselor, in my system of thought, must learn to philosophize and to help his student clientele philosophize about the meaning of life and the alternative ways of becoming one's potentialities. Back of every procedure and technique are hidden assumptions about value commitment and it is a wise counselor who learns to explicate and learns how to "teach" his clientele to explicate these hidden assumptions underlying his values.

One such "hidden" assumption is: the nature of human nature. And we have had a lot of nonsense written in the last quarter century about the hidden assumption of the nature of human nature. I happen to hold (not as a pessimist in a Freudian sense, nor as an optimist in the Rogerian sense) to the tabular rosa concept of the nature of human nature; hopefully that as a result of counseling, we can help the individual become a humane person. To be sure, many of our students have no desire to become humane (perhaps especially if they understood the models!) and we counselors will someday face some interesting civil liberties issue as to whether "I must do what I should do and can do"?

I happen to be involved right now in examining another hidden assumption behind the work of the counselor: that is the nature of freedom. With my colleague I am completing a book about the prevalence of freedom enjoyed by college students. Everybody feels strongly about freedom, but no one does any research on it. I happen to believe that the counselor is in a rare position, like parents, to help students begin to understand the

implications of their own "hidden" concept of freedom. And I refer to the Berkeley "bearded ones"--their concept of freedom is to get rid of external authority. In Western culture this is an old problem which recurs or rather erupts frequently. I heard one of these students assert that nobody should be "over me". Isn't that a silly concept of freedom? In the westward tour, when I was giving my lecture on freedom and responsibility (which they did not like)--I wish I could have crated up one of the "bearded ones" and taken him home and held a year long seminar on freedom. It would have been very fascinating because the prevailing concept of freedom seemed to be to get rid of authority "over them".

Well, there are all kinds of other hidden assumptions of this sort that we need to philosphize about with students and not merely learn techniques, important though they are as means to attain end goals, and, I repeat, the end goal for me is to help the individual become humane.

Now, let me proceed with my dicussion on your topic by identifying very briefly ten major changes in the last half-century in the work of the counselor. Now, there may be eleven in existence that I have not been able to find yet. Perhaps we have time for interaction--you can teach me. I am always open to correction--being a dean.

Our founding father identified the role of the counselor as helping the youth of North Boston to make a life career choice (Frank Parsons). It was a kind of once-and-for-all type of thinking. We now see that this is inadequate, not only because one must change one's life career when one is run over by an automobile, but also because of obsolescence of work and because of obsolescence of motivation. Individuals do change their aspirations. We are taught that aptitudes do not change, but what one wants to do with aptitudes does undergo profound changes through the years.

When I was being initiated into counseling (I never had the benefit of any courses in counseling or any counseling myself--I stumbled into this field), it was often a social worker's crude diagnostic interpretation that if the client changes jobs too often, this was a sign of instability. Well, now we assume that maybe it is wise to change as one discovers new kinds of a life to live, which one never had thought of before. Moreover, one of the most magnificent things about the decade of the '60s is that we are opening up new vistas of hope and opportunity and understanding for "the neglected ones", the racial minority, the culturally deprived. We are giving them understanding of worlds of opportunities that they never were even aware of and this changes the whole repertoire of the counselor's technique.

Anticipated change is another fascinating problem in counseling. I have written an article about anticipated change: how do we teach youngsters of today to anticipate change from their own style of living, sometime during their life, without overpowering them? If we are not careful, we will continue this fiction that we had fifty years ago, that once you choose you are fixed for a lifetime. Today we realize we face a new set of problems as a counselor seeks to teach that change is inevitable-- and controllable, one would hope. It is a very fascinating problem, as I said earlier, because ours is not a fixed universe, but we can frighten students by telling them that cybernetics is going to make them obsolescent. We must forge new techniques with many psychotherapeutic overtones.

My second basic change that I want to mention was Parsons' original idea-- the choice of one's vocation as being the chief work of the counselor. We now see that while this is basic, of course, in our kind of industrial economy, which has an insatiable need for trained manpower, even though they are obsolescent, rapidly, this is still important. We are a working

nation; we are not a nation (or are we?) of haves and have not, of a leisure class that does not work. I refer to Calvanism--well, Luther as well held the same concept that you have a moral commitment to use the talents that were "given" to you. But work is not the only way to use your talents and there is now a whole new range of counseling opportunities opened up when we deal with problems of value options. I published an article in a recent Personnel and Guidance Journal on this topic. In my amateurish way I am trying to do a little homework, a little thinking about it. We cannot be indifferent to the kind of person that an individual wants to become. We are not in the business of helping people learn more efficiently how to debase others. We are in the business of helping people to become humane and this is obviously a value commitment. Then we plunge into the very fascinating problem--who sets the value hierarchy? I wish I had time to explore some of the alternative answers. Who determines the nature of the good life; really, what is it? And we counselors have avoided this problem for a half century in one way or another.

My third major change over the last half-century or more is an elaboration, or an extension of Parsons' three-step formula, which still has some validity today: "Analyze yourselves; analyze the requirements of work and compare the two". Well, counseling is not that simple. The whole individual is involved in his work and that is only one part of his whole life. Since the 1951 Northwestern meeting, the counseling psychology movement has been trying to expand Parsons in a new formulation, fairly well along, which would not only deal with a choice of career, but also with personality development, in a profound sense, becoming a person, and with therapy. We can no longer ignore the fact that the growing individual undergoes stress and strain, even in the best of homes and, therefore, the

counselor of the future and even now today, in many instances, must have some therapeutics sophistication. There is a very interesting digression in the history of counseling. Kitson apparently gave up Parsons' three-step formula in favor of self-analysis, a kind of do-it-yourself type of counseling. It is enjoyable rereading Kitson now. He is a fascinating character. I have written about him in my last book, so I will not take the time here; but I do not mean to belittle him--his was a digression. If the individual is able, sophisticated, wise enough to understand himself unaided, then you and I are superfluous. But we know full well that many students do need aid and those who do not volunteer for it often need it the most. I will just point in passing to the great unsolved problem--how do we persuade students who need counseling to seek it?

As for me, I have enjoyed much fun for twenty-five years being an "authority figure" (a Dean!). I can "require" students to be counseled, if I can only catch them in a discipline act. (We set up bear traps all over our campus.) I have analyzed and discussed the threat (the folklore it is, really) that only the volunteer can be counseled! In my opinion, this is sheer nonsense. Well, I have no time to go into that digression either. I hope I raise more questions than I give you answers for tonight and that you go home saying he didn't tell me anything that I didn't already know! I am reminded again of that session with the administrative interns. One expert on curriculum development was discussing some of the unsolved problems of this part of American higher education and, after he was finished, some of them said--"he didn't tell us; he didn't give us the answers." Now, that is a very interesting reaction from adult educators. All of you have met this expectation with adolescents who come in and say, "Quick, doc--give me a test and tell me what I should become...between classes."

But human development is not quite that simple. The human person is a little bit more complex than that, although Parsons did not know that and neither did Kitson; but we are now catching on to the fact and perhaps in a couple of more millenia we may know enough to really counsel. I want to come back and see about my hope.

The fourth major change in counseling over the last half-century is a very fascinating one, only partially completed. Counseling is viewed as one of many inter-related relationships. It is a very fascinating thing to read in history in 1910, the first year that Freud came to America at William James' invitation, the child guidance clinic movement was originated in Chicago and it developed pretty much as an isolated service, later insulated from the schools and the community--and sometimes the parents. I was on a campus last summer and observed a contemporary 1910 mentality (they are fascinating museum pieces). Here was a counselor, I was told, a counselor who would not accept a referral. A member of the dean's staff called up this counselor and said--I want to send such-and-such a girl to you because she's in trouble, psychologically. And the counselor said, I won't see her unless she can come in voluntarily. Well, this is a 1910 mentality of the child guidance clinic movement, as I read history. We do not need to repeat that mistake and it would not happen on my campus because that counselor would be given options: freedom of choice. No, we could have learned from industrial psychology in 1910, even prior to World War I, the concept of counseling relationships as one of a number of inter-related relationships, helping relationships, as it was developed by Walter Dill Scott and other industrial psychologists. And now we are beginning to talk about personnel services and student personnel services on the collegiate level, and I confidently expect that in the elementary school counseling will not be an isolated service.

Let me give you just one more example of what I mean by not being an isolated service. The training of some counselors is limited to the dyadic relationship. They do not know how to counsel a recalcitrant teacher who exaggerates, if not causes, more psychotherapeutic cases than can be handled by a therapist; or a dictatorial principal and some deans of students! No, instead of isolating in the dyadic relationship of one-to-one, we need to branch out and become one vector force in setting the climate of the school. And this is the reason why I sought to make a virtue out of a necessity. That is, I inherited discipline as a responsibility, so I tried to make something out of it that would be rehabilitative and I think we have succeeded. In my institution we do not drop many students; we don't have to--we rehabilitate them. Some of them are "reluctant clients", to be sure, but nevertheless we do not have much recidivism.

The fifth major change I identify over the past decades. There is, of course, much history back of Parsons, but I am using him as a dividing point because it is conventional and because some textbooks do not tell us what happened before Parsons because some writers do not seem to know what happened before Parsons. But there was much invention before Parsons, although he was a great man--a great man. For one relevant characteristic, he was a rebel. He was rebelling against the "robber barons" of the 1880s and the 1890s; he was trying to forge a new kind of political, economic theory for the poor people, the little people, the neglected ones of his day. Indeed, he was discharged from Kansas State Agricultural College because of this effort. I ask counselors today, "How many times have you been fired as a counselor because you were trying to change the principal from being a dictatorial one to one who likes humanity?" Well, let me go on with my fifth point.

My mentor, D.D. Paterson (who was an industrial psychologist and an Army psychologist and one who brought the pattern of thinking into the university picture, which has now been spread down to the secondary and into the elementary levels), defined student personnel work, as it has now come to be called, as "the individualization of mass education". Now, just try to project that concept into the future as the enrollments really become large--the individualization of mass education--it has never been done before in any culture. Indeed, it has never been attempted in any culture, from ancient Greece on up through Rome. And yet this is the very essence of the educated relationship, individualization. It is indeed a fascinating problem to conjur with in the midst of large numbers: how can you not lose the individual, or at least how can you help him perceive that we care (alienation)? This is a terribly difficult task and we have not yet faced up to it. We counselors just wait for the volunteers to ask for our aid. Now that in North America, or at least in the United States, "everyone has to become educated up to the limits of their capacities" --whether they want to or not (that is a civil liberties issue), how are we to avoid perceived denegration, or to use Marx's term, alienation? You will recall that the journalists explain, and some faculty members, too, more than we knew in hard data(!) by using that term. Namely, that students felt alienated because of the size of Berkeley.

Let me add, as a gratuitous footnote of my own, one "bit" of evidence that has never been put together. We have, in my institution, a beginning psychology class of 2,200 students, and that makes many persons shudder. Our number two daughter enrolled in that class and was ecstatic in her praise of that experience.

No, the whole problem of not losing the individual, or at least creating the perception that we care, is really the task of the counselor, as well as everyone else in the school system. But it is the counselor who should be educating everyone instead of letting the principal push students out because they do not conform. We will encounter many other unsolved problems as we increase the societal uses of education. I just had a running battle with a man at a public university, whose formula is to send most enrolled students to the factory or to the apprenticeship, thus to reduce enrollment, since not all need to be educated within the school (what kind of school?).

My sixth change I referred to is the abandonment of neutrality. Certain therapists, not all of them but certain ones unnamed, have really made us experience guilt feelings, if we sit in judgment during counseling. Have you ever heard that term? I have a paper in press about it. I worked up a "good mad" during my vacation on Lake Superior last summer, preparing for a debate with Doug Arbuckle about it. The debate didn't come off because we were not talking to the same point. Years ago I was giving a talk about neutrality and how antithetical it was to the counseling relationship, which should be a caring one, and if you care you don't want it to be neutral to the outcome of the individual's aspirations and development. A counselor, a school counselor made this remark: "But we have been told all summer we should not sit in judgment." I said, "Rubbish!" (and I do think it is rubbish)--it is not well thought out philosophically or psychologically. If you don't care what kind of individual your clientele becomes, then why bother about counseling him at all? Of course you must care; let's get rid of this nonsense that we do not sit in judgment; we do, and then we get into the very, very complex problem of external criteria of excellence, beyond the internal

criteria that we seem to have accepted in America as a justification of our permissiveness in child rearing, the concept that anything that little Johnnie wants to do we shouldn't interfere: rubbish (or Humbug!).

But there are some unsolved problems about the establishment of external criteria and this is one of the reasons why I say that every counselor must learn to philosophize, as well as become a logician, and it would not hurt if we learn a little semantics, too.

My seventh point has to do with the very, very complicated problem: how does one rise above one's own prejudices? I identified mine; I said Calvanistic commitment to industriousness. I hate lazy people and I am sure it shows through, as I intend it to. Is that immoral? Well, it is at least middle-class morality. It is a fascinating problem. As a counselor, how can one be a person with one's own integrity (even a counselor has rights!), which means value commitment, without "imposing" them upon one's clientele? It is a fascinating problem to me and I read the Swedish economist's (Myrdahl) writings and I find one possible answer and that is to <u>explicate</u> your own value commitments so that you know what they are and label them and put them on the table for your clientele to see and then let him make his choice, which he has a moral duty and a moral right to do. And, indeed, the high ability underachievers that I tried (1930 decade) to counsel into Calvanistic industriousness just told me to go to hell! Well, they exercised their right of choice! I could not do anything about it. I had exhausted my obligation.

We are all so ridden with our own <u>unconscious</u> value commitments that we impose them, as though there were no freedom of choice among alternatives!

You may be startled at one example. There is a fascinating article by a psychologist by the name of Truax in a recent issue of the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology on the topic of conditioning in Rogerian therapy (shades of Skinner!). This is a very serious study, not a polemic, but is a serious analysis of one of Rogers' cases and an identification of reward and the withholding of approval, which is operant conditioning of the Skinnerian type--shades, shades, shades. Who would have thought that Rogers believed and practices operant conditioning; and yet here is a document. Go read it yourself and reach your own bias conclusion (I have reached mine!).

We need ever to remind ourselves that we counselors and teachers who are middle class, we are value committed; but we fail to explicate them sufficiently so that we avoid imposing them by operant conditioning of a subtle sort, that is, by operant conditioning I reward the individual when he makes the right response and I withhold a reward when he does not. I don't even say "ug, huh" anymore. But seriously, I am interested in understanding who I am, so that I will not impose upon another individual, but will open up whole vistas of options; but (my bias shows through again!) I will make it clear to him that I hope that he chooses to become a humane person, which is an external criterion.

Well, to go on. My eighth change that I want to mention over the last half-century is the whole problem of what to do with your life when automation really catches up with us. Mr. Hutchins, in a recent issue of The Saturday Review, has a formula for it--as he usually has. It is a very simple formula: when you no longer have to work, you can become educated and by educated he means that you can learn to philosophize. I happen to agree that is one of man's unused capacities and, in this

sense, I think we are beginning to see that merely choosing the kind of individual you want to become, in the sense of work, is not sufficient. You must learn to deal with the great issues of life and the great problems, some of which may be insoluable. The German existentialist, Jasper, said "we need endurance in the tensions of insoluability," while he was talking about another problem; but this is a good starting point for us to begin to see that we have not completed our task as a counselor, when the individual has completed a choice of life objective.

This choice is an oversimplification. I experienced this once with regard to a son. When he was about the sixth or seventh grade, he came home one night and kept interrupting me while I was reading the newspaper, which I like to do. I thought I had a "right" to be uninterrupted while I was reading the newspaper, but he didn't know that then and he said, "Dad, what am I going to be when I grow up?" I said, "Son, I can't give you a quick answer to so complex a question; it takes time to even arrive at an understanding of what you <u>could</u> become." "Well, I've got to know. I've got to know before tomorrow morning." And I said, "--now, wait a minute; I've spent my professional career trying to give adequate answers to simple questions like this and it cannot be done that rapidly. Why do you have to know by tomorrow morning?" "My home teacher has a form to fill out and everyone of us has to tell her what they want to be when they grow up."

You see, how silly can you be. We have really created the notion of <u>unthinking</u> as a virtue, of snatching at answers.

I have a second list, which is forever growing, of unanswered questions. I am reconciled to the conclusion that I am not going to be smart enough to answer them in my lifetime. I think each must endure the tensions of insoluability of some of the big questions. The educated person is, for

me, one who keeps carrying on a personal seminar with himself about these great questions. John Dewey said science does not so much answer questions as it gets hold of them--meaning that you learn to reformulate the questions that you put to nature or to human nature. It is the formulation of the question which is the art of thinking, and we need to think about that as the counselor's function. I think Mr. Hutchins is right; I am reluctant to say so publicly, but I think he is right in this respect. We have substituted work activity and fun activity for thinking as virtuous --perhaps the highest academic virtue. And this is sad; this is not what we ought to be doing in counseling and in education as a whole.

My ninth change I have lived long enough to see come to notice and establishment. I received a letter from a secondary school counselor in California. I had written to him because I was asked to be a commentator in a very, very fascinating and unique (the only one of its kind I ever heard of) program at a California Counselors' Association meeting last February, I believe it was. Three <u>practicing</u> counselors related or told how they handled discipline (<u>mirabu dictu</u>!), something that the textbooks say you should not do. As a matter of fact, I was with two counselor educators just a few months ago. They both admonished the counselors in the audience to have nothing to do with discipline. Well, it so happens I have been doing what they said I cannot do for twenty-five years; but, emperical data does not mean very much in some discussions.

The essential point I make is that the implication (cost) of isolating ourselves from <u>character molding</u>, <u>which is what discipline is</u>, character molding. Now what was meant was that we educators really ought to take a course in semantics, and a course in logic wouldn't hurt us either. But I think what they were really saying was that the kind of discipline

which is punishment retribution you counselors should not be associated with. Well! I would agree with them and have published articles.

I was arguing this same point with a seminar once and I did not get anywhere. I met resistance. I was a visiting professor, so they did me the honor of listening resistingly to whatever I said. And, finally, one of them said, "Don't you think there ought to be one office in the school that has no authority over a student that could be threatening?" I said, "rubbish", again. "There is not any such Shangrila and for us to keep on perpetuating the search of Shangrila is to prolong infancy and the individual never grows up to learn to live under authority."

This happens to be my theory, 2,000 miles away, to explain the Berkeley phenomena. Some bearded ones did not want to accept authority, except their own. We have one member of our faculty who says, "I am responsible only to myself." I refer to him as a parasite, in the botanical sense. (I, too, require a special dependency relationship with a benign institution for my special work!) He could not exist, responsible only to himself, if there was not a benign host institution.

To return to the California report on discipline by counselors, this meeting was glorious because that which we had been told by some counselor educators and some textbooks that cannot be and should not be done, was being done and apparently they were having a good time, too, and reforming discipline so that it became educative--not repressive! Just think of the billions of dollars we have wasted on prisons, gaols--because we do not know how to change characters, except to lock them up. Now I could build a psychological case that you can get some good out of locking people up, but this is not true in the schools; all you do is push them out and, to me, a push out is a criterion of failure.

My tenth and last major change I want to mention tonight is that we are gradually, reluctantly, almost amateurishly going beyond technique. Usually at this point I hold up a book on counseling, which is one of the most beautiful books of its kind I have ever read. I have read that book carefully and, as far as I can see, there is not a single unsolved problem in counseling mentioned. It is as though that all that needs to be known and is knowable is known. I think this is very immature and I think we are gradually beginning to see that techniques must not only have a philosophic orientation, but they must be developed on a technological foundation of human development. I said that this is one of the great changes: we know more about human development today than we used to know. More and more counselors need to be trained and are being trained in many schools in foundation courses in human development that are increasingly sophisticated because we do research now. Indeed, research has been built into the educated process. Some day it will be built into the basic training of a counselor. The out-of-datedness phenomenon of techniques that are not based upon current, relevant and sound technological foundations of human development is tragic. I was trying to give this kind of message to an institute in another one of our states, western states, and there was a man in the audience--I thought I identified him as a teacher being retooled by a three-day institute to become a counselor, which in itself is a very interesting point--and he said, "You make it sound so complicated!" I said, well "I intend to because after some forty years of trying to learn about human development through education and especially counseling, I am just beginning to get out of the kindergarten." Perhaps by the year 2000 (I have said this in print)--by the year 2000 counselors (should) may be required to have two Ph.Ds, one in a teaching discipline and one in the, as yet, not fully developed

technology of human development. I do not see any way out of it. Human development is so terribly complex and we are so woefully ignorant about how to make it come out right--look at the dropout rate which represents failure on our part. Well, we must forge an underpinning of solid understanding. I draw upon the analogy with medical education. Until the 1910 Carnegie report on medical education, the training of doctors was just that--bedside observation. Now they begin, at least in the second year, to teach them research on problems of physiology and pathology, and this and other reforms have remade modern medicine; it has remade it so that it is much more effective, so that one gets beyond the aspirin technique into the changing of pathology and, if it had not been for research, development of a technology underlying practice, we never would have gotten there. Something like this has got to happen in counseling, if it is to get beyond the Parsons stage. I believe Parsons would have approved of that, because he was looking for technical understanding. Kitson and Brewer were not; they believed that human nature was simple, or that counseling technique was very simple.

Now, this one man's reading of history, may be wrong. I would be very glad to be proved wrong, but it seems to me that these basic changes permit us to approximate closer to adequacy in aiding students to grow up and to become humane persons and to use their full potentialities, instead of living half lives or lives of misery or lives of indolence,--wasted lives--and it is our rare opportunity to help individuals perceive a vision of what a human life can be and the great satisfactions that can come from becoming what you are capable of becoming--a fully humane person.